



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME RECENT THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN
OF THE APOCALYPSE.

BY EDWARD CALDWELL MOORE.

IT was a saying, I think of the renowned Dr. South, that the study of the Apocalypse either finds a man mad or makes him so. It is certainly true that morbid interest in Scripture has had a way of fastening, as upon certain of the prophetic books — notably Daniel — in the Old Testament, so upon the book of the Revelation in the New. The multiplicity of supposed results obtained even from sober study and the absence of any respectable deposit of accepted result from the labor of the ages suggest nothing so much as the inadequacy of the dogmatic and allegorizing methods of interpretation, which have been the ones heretofore almost universally employed. So much, I presume, is admitted, that an historical and critical exegesis, which seeks to win an understanding of the book in its relation to the circumstances of its time, is the only mode of procedure which holds out the hope of real conclusions in the matter. That method has been employed only within comparatively recent years. And some attempts of this sort have certainly been marked by an arbitrariness and a zeal in the construction of hypotheses which, in this new direction, compare favorably with the visions of the allegorists in the old. The direction, however, is the important matter. And though it can by no means be claimed that we have thus been led to a solution, though perhaps it may be doubted if an absolute solution is to be obtained, yet it is something that the question is even correctly stated and the way pointed out which scientific investigation may with reason and expectancy pursue.

Perhaps the first hint was given in the recognition of the true nature of the similarity alluded to between the Apocalypse and the book of Daniel. This book of visions, put into the mouth of the old saint and hero of Nebuchadnezzar's and Darius's time, deals with the relations, past, present, and future, of the Jewish people to the heathen world-monarchies, from the point of view of a devout spirit of the Maccabean time, who sought, for purposes of admonition and of comfort, to

clothe those relations with his own deep faith and hope. And no one can read the Apocalypse and the book of Daniel without feeling that to a certain extent they move in the same atmosphere.

But this remark is still more true of the apocryphal book of Enoch. And the interesting thing here is, that it is agreed among scholars that the latter work, as we have it, is made up of three or perhaps more parts, which are to be assigned to different authors and to different times. The first part, a cosmology, a topography of the other world, and a sort of philosophy of history, in two visions, is assigned to the time of John Hyrcanus. The part from chapter 37 moves in an entirely different circle of ideas. Here the judgment is no longer accomplished upon earth by the victorious sword of the Jews, but is an act of supernatural might executed from the throne of glory, and followed by the final state of blessedness of the elect in another than earthly form of their existence and their joy. The question can be only whether that is the thought of later Jews of spiritualizing tendencies, or whether it is actually Christian. Interpolations, at any rate, beyond all question Christian, are to be found in the book, marked by some freedom, and yet more marked perhaps by a reserve intelligible as over against a book with the halo of sacredness, as revelation, on it. Pfeiderer feels the more sure of Christian, and of course later, interpolations in the book, for the fact that the Epistle of Jude, quoting the book, has not quoted one of these.

The notion that in the Apocalypse also we have to deal with a writing composed of Jewish and Christian elements, did not indeed arise from the recognition of this state of things in the book of Enoch. But that recognition certainly gave precision to the formulation of the question :—Can the Apocalypse as we have it be attributed to one author? Are the contradictions in it not rather evidence that either an older writing has here been worked over in some way, or that older material has been worked into a new writing? And the inquiry is stimulated by the knowledge of the fact that, of all the writings of this order which have come down to us, there is probably not one which is intact, that is, has the form which the first author gave to the materials.¹

¹ Cf. Holtzmann, *Einleitung in d. N.T.* 225; Schnapp, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht*, Halle, 1884; see *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*. 1885, 203, and Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalt. Jesu Christi*. Bd. II. 662 f.; cf. also Kabisch, *Das vierte Buch Esra auf s. Quellen untersucht*. Göttingen, 1889;

This fact has an explanation, perhaps, in the nature of this form of literature. Written in times of religious and national distress, the apocalypses became dear to men's hearts as the expression of their faith and of God's promises. Resting, as all such works must do, upon the circumstances of their own time, they came presently to need interpretation in the light of a new time. And the prophetic hope of the new time, not always having originality to soar to new flights, was sometimes content to adjust and apply to its own need words already dear to men. The reverence for Jewish sacred writings, even in Gentile circles, which recent study of the origin of the canon has revealed, makes such a reverent and affectionate working over of a Jewish apocalypse by a Christian hand, or the incorporation of Jewish elements almost untouched within a Christian one, by no means inconceivable. But let us try briefly to state the problem which by some such supposition is to be solved.

The Apocalypse begins with a double introduction — a general one for the whole book, i. 1–3; and a special one, i. 4–20, for the letters of chapters ii. and iii. The first is a sort of superscription, indicating that the substance of the book is a revelation from Jesus Christ through angels to his servant John, who testifies what he has seen. In the second introduction, the Pauline formula, "Grace unto you, and peace," has received the striking addition, "From him that was and is and is to come, and from the seven spirits that are before the throne, and from Jesus Christ the true witness, the first-born of the dead and the ruler over the kings of the earth." Then follows a doxology, which is almost undeniably related to 1 Peter i. 19 and ii. 9. Then the real point of the early Christian hope, the return of the crucified Christ to the judgment of his enemies, is put forth as the theme of what is to follow, in words which seem to combine Dan. vii. 13 with Zech. xii. 10, and to echo Matt. xxiv. 30.² Then the seer describes how, being in the spirit on the Lord's day, he heard a voice commanding him to write to the seven churches, and how he saw one like unto the Son of Man standing in the midst of the seven candlesticks, which are then interpreted as the seven communities named, and the seven stars as the angels of these — surely not the human representatives, but the

see Gunkel in *Ltztg.* 1891, 5. Kabisch's work is a somewhat adventurous attempt to apply the thesis to a Jewish Apocalypse.

² Cf. Barnabas 7, 9; see Pfeiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 320.

personified spirit, genius, of these communities. The seven letters which then follow have little or nothing to do with either the substance or the framework of the book at large; have little in common with its descriptions of the state of things in the world and its prophecies as to the course of history. On the contrary, it is the present inner life of the communities with which they, in the way of praise and blame, of admonition and comfort, of threat and promise, exclusively concern themselves. The only marks for the determination of the time with which they deal are the allusions to persecution and heresy, and these are such as to make it extremely difficult to think of them as written before the end of the first century.

Very striking is the opening of the fourth chapter, with repetition of the words about the vision. And here begins what in the book is really apocalyptic. The first vision is of the throne in heaven, with the four "beasts" and the four and twenty elders. At the right hand of God lies the great book of the future, of which no man may loose the seals until the Lamb slain appears and receives it, whereupon he is greeted with the praises of the heavenly beings and of the whole creation. He begins to open the seals of the book. In the first seal is the promise of his own victorious return. In the second, third, and fourth are the woes promised as connected with his coming — war, famine, pestilence. In the fifth, admonition of faith to the witnesses; and in the sixth, the signs in heaven of the approaching end of the world. The elect are sealed in order that they may escape the plagues, and the witnesses who may perish in the last conflict are assured of their triumph in heaven. But what those plagues and that triumph are to be, it is left to future visions to make known. When the seventh seal is opened there is silence in heaven. But the vision of the end of all things is not given here.

Now the extraordinary thing is in chapter vii., where the angel arising from the east bids the four angels of the judgment stay until the servants of God have been sealed. Those sealed are a hundred and forty and four thousand, twelve thousand out of each of the twelve tribes of Israel, which are named. But then follows at once the vision of a multitude which no man could number, of all tribes and peoples and tongues, who come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes white in the blood of the Lamb, and are therefore before God and serve him day and night in his temple, and by him and by the Lamb are preserved from every ill. That this unnumbered multitude

is composed of Gentile Christians is clear. But their relation to the hundred and forty and four thousand of the sealed of Israel is by no means clear. Is it that for the author the Jewish Christians have the preference which the passage about the sealing of itself would imply? That would be nothing unthinkable. But the exalted description of the blessedness of the others seems written almost of purpose to take away the idea of any such preference. Is it that the second passage has been placed alongside of the first so as to widen the meaning and application of that first into the full Christian sense? And if so, is the first passage to be understood of Jewish Christians, or of Jews, the pious remnant of Israel, without reference to the Christ? That is, is the Christian fragment an insertion in the Jewish; or is the Jewish fragment, one familiar to the Jewish Christians, bedded in the Christian writing here?

With viii. 2 begins a vision with a superscription of its own, describing it as the vision of the seven angels before the throne, with their seven trumpets. At the blowing of these, the plagues above alluded to, from which the elect are spared, go forth over the heathen world as a last, though useless, warning to repentance. The fifth and sixth, the locusts and the furious horses with their riders, are put forth as scourges of God terrible beyond the others. The last plague is here again concealed. We hear only of the joy in heaven at the fulfilment of things which is thus reached. The connection seems to be broken by a vision of judgment upon Jerusalem, in which the prophet himself, after Old Testament fashion, has a symbolic part to take in measuring the city. The Temple is to be spared, but the city is to be given over to the heathen forty and two months. There are two prophets with supernatural powers, who, after they have finished their testimony, are nevertheless overcome and slain by the beast who arises out of the abyss. Then, however, after they have lain three days and a half unburied, the spirit of God comes upon them, and they arise and are borne away to heaven. An earthquake destroys a tenth part of the city, and seven thousand of the inhabitants perish. About the only thing which can with security be said is, that the passage, from the allusion to the Temple, must have been written before 70 A.D. But who are the two witnesses? Are they Moses and Elijah, as these appear so often as the forerunners of the Messianic time? Or are they historical personages of the time of the approaching judgment on

Jerusalem, as, say, the high-priests Jesus and Ananus?³ In either case, the difficulty is still very great. And this can hardly be disputed: that the words "where also their Lord was crucified," in the last clause of verse 8, strike a note which from the beginning to the end of the passage has not elsewhere its like. If they were Christian witnesses, then it is only still more strange that the guilt of Jerusalem should be illustrated upon them, and not rather on their Lord.

With xi. 19 the connection is in some measure resumed, and with the introduction about the opening of the heavenly Temple and the appearance of the ark of the covenant, seems really to be leading to the final scene. Instead, however, comes the great vision of the woman clothed with the sun, and having the moon at her feet and a crown of twelve stars upon her head. In anguish she is delivered of a son, who is described as one who is to rule the nations with a rod of iron, plainly the Messiah. A great and fiery dragon stands ready to devour the child so soon as it be born. But the child is snatched away to the throne of God, while the woman flees into the wilderness to a place prepared for her. There is war in heaven between Michael and the dragon, and the dragon is cast out. But upon earth the devil, as the dragon at this point is called, rages and pursues the woman. She, indeed, makes good her escape, but the dragon prosecutes the war with the rest of her seed, of whom it is said that they keep the commandments of God and hold the testimony of Jesus. It seems beyond dispute that the woman can be no human personage, — least of all Mary, — but an ideal, typical figure, whose reference to the people of Israel is indicated already in the crown with twelve stars upon her head, as likewise in the phrase concerning the rest of her seed. And yet not so simply the historic Israel. It is a heavenly figure, the personified idea of the Theocracy. And just so the birth of the Messiah; even if one were not to press the phrase of the first verse, "in heaven," as applicable to the whole passage, yet it is no earthly event which is here portrayed. It is not clear that it is even a past event. And least of all does it bear the faintest resemblance to the birth of Jesus. The victory over the old serpent, the devil, is not in any way connected with either the life or the death of the Messiah, not even as if he had been the beginner of a victorious struggle. The whole is attributed to God and the angels, the child being carried away to heaven as soon as he

³ Josephus, *b. j.* iv. 5, 2; Pfeiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 328, suggests this possibility.

is born, to return only in the celebration of the triumph and fulfilment of the glorious hope. And the dragon's pursuit of the woman, and his warfare with her other children still upon the earth, seems to bring to evidence the conclusion that we have here to do with a Jewish apocalyptic passage pure and simple, about which, at first sight, one would confidently say that it has not the semblance of allusion to the historic Christ. There is only one thing to say to the contrary — that the Messiah is here spoken of as born. And that is a Christian representation, not a Jewish one. The passage which Vischer quotes (p. 27) from the Talmud seems certainly derived from this one.⁴ And Weizsäcker holds (*Litzg.* 1890, 470) that what the passage promises is the deliverance of the faithful; and this, the deliverance of their Lord prefigures. It is accomplished in his going away before the completion of his work. Of his life there was no occasion here to speak. But even so, the enigma of the form under which this idea is conveyed remains. And the words of xii. 11 seem to strike a note new and strange, just as in that other case we saw.

The vision of the beast, in chapter xiii., goes back to that in Daniel vii. 4–6, 21; iii. 15, only that the beast here has seven heads instead of four, and these are in xvii. 9 interpreted in a twofold way; first, as the seven mountains upon which the woman sits, and then as seven kings. The beast is therefore plainly the Roman world-power, now thought of as the city on the seven hills, and now as personified in the Roman emperors. There can be little doubt that when it says in xvii. 10 that the five heads are fallen, the fifth is Nero, and the sixth, who now is, Vespasian; the three emperors of the bloody year 68 A.D. not being counted. And yet the death of Nero and the violent interregnum would seem to be alluded to in the death-wound of the beast, which is now healed in the sixth emperor. The seventh cannot be other than Titus. And the question whether the eighth (xvii. 11), who was and is not and goeth into perdition, is the mythical returning Nero or the historic Domitian vividly compared to Nero, is of interest chiefly because in that last case, and perhaps also in the first, the passage must be thought of as touched over in Domitian's time. For the context at large must have been written under Vespasian.

For the second beast of chapter xiii., for which idolatrous worship is demanded, there can be little doubt that Mommsen has touched the

⁴ See Hilgenfeld in *Ztschrift. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1890, 445; Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, London, 1877, 279.

right point with his interpretation of the reference as to the Roman provincial officers of Asia.⁵ It has been a source of confusion that the expression in verse 7, "to make war with the saints," has been supposed to allude to the Neronian persecution. Whereas it is perfectly plain that the whole passage is directed against the Roman provincial government in general, and its demand of the worship of the emperor in particular. And, as Mommsen adds, the fact that of the seven emperors Nero alone is mentioned by name — for I presume that the reading נרין קסר for the number 666 is one of the things which may be reasonably regarded as fixed — is not because he was in the mind of the author the most obnoxious. The naming of the living emperor was dangerous, while Nero's name was already given over to contumely; and the legend of his return from the East to take vengeance on his enemies conspired with these things to make him the fit representative of the imperial tyranny and the Antichrist. In the association of the Book of Life (well known from Daniel and Enoch) with the Lamb, and in the warning against self-help and the admonition to the patience of the saints, we have here again a group of phrases distinctively and unmistakably Christian, in the midst of a context which far and wide about them would of itself suggest no such thought.

With the beginning of chapter xiv. we come upon a passage of considerable length, which bears all the marks of Christian origin. The hundred and forty and four thousand of the sacred symbolism appears again here, but applied not to Jews or to Jewish Christians, but to the multitude who appear with the Lamb, having his name and his Father's name in their foreheads. It is said that they had been bought for God and the Lamb as first fruits, and they had not defiled themselves with women, and in their mouth was found no lie. It is not at all necessary to go back to vii. 2 for the symbolical number. It was one not at all surprising for a Christian to use. But it is very surprising to find among the marks of these *élite* among the saints that of virginity, with all the emphasis upon asceticism which that would imply.

Chapter xiv. 6 begins a new vision. But the words "And I saw another angel" find no point which could have suggested them until one returns to x. 1-7. The angel proclaims an everlasting gospel "to all them that dwell upon the earth, and unto every nation and

⁵ *Römische Geschichte*, v. 520 f.

tribe and tongue and people." But the content of this gospel is, nevertheless, not the Christian good news of salvation, but simply the mandate to worship God who has created the whole world. Now, unquestionably monotheism was in the early Christian preaching a point of the first importance. But it is certainly very striking in a Christian writing to hear simple monotheism spoken of as the everlasting gospel.

Chapters xv. and xvi. contain a vision of the seven vials, not without reminder of that in chapters viii. and ix., and full of Old Testament imagery drawn from the narrative of the Egyptian plagues. They constitute a sort of introduction to chapters xvii. and xviii., the great world-historic judgment of Rome. She is described as Babylon, the mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth; as herself the great harlot, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and who has made them that dwell upon the earth drunken with the wine of her fornication; as arrayed in purple and scarlet, and sitting upon a scarlet beast full of the names of blasphemy. It is as the one guilty of all the blood of the slain in all the earth that the saints are called upon to rejoice in her fall.

In the beginning of chapter xix. the prophet hears the song even of the heavenly hosts rejoicing over the fall of Rome. And this is made the beginning of the vision of judgment of all the powers of the earth, whose kings and armies now the Messiah, sitting upon a white horse and with his garments sprinkled with blood, treading the wine-press of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God, destroys. Whereupon an angel standing in the sun calls to the birds that fly in heaven to be gathered together to the great meal of God, that they may eat the flesh of kings and of captains and of mighty men and of horses and of them that sit thereon. And the beast and the kings of the earth make war with him on the horse and are overthrown, and the false prophet with them, that wrought the sign wherewith he deceived them that received the mark of the beast; and they are cast alive into the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone. After the account of the judgment of Rome, comes that of the general judgment, first of Satan, who is cast into the abyss for a thousand years, while Christ reigns upon earth with his risen martyrs as judges. Then Satan is let loose again, and makes war with the nations and on the saints and on the beloved city; but fire from heaven destroys them, and they too are cast into the flames. Then comes the general resur-

rection, and the judgment, on the part of God himself, of every man according to his works. Since the earliest Christian eschatology borrowed almost all its apparatus of representation, and not a little even of that which it would represent, from the Jewish, it is difficult indeed to say that all of this cannot be purely Jewish. But it is impossible to say that it cannot be Christian. Such a determinate reign of the Messiah on the earth before the end of the world is found in the apocalypses well known to Jewish Christians, in Enoch and Baruch without any indication of the length of time, and in the fourth book of Ezra as fixed at four hundred years.⁶

After the end of the judgment the personified Death and Hell are cast into the sea of fire with the lost, and with xxi. 1 begins the account of the restoration of all things. The New Jerusalem comes down from God out of heaven. The river of life is seen going forth from the throne of God and of the Lamb; the tree of life is on its banks, with monthly fruit of twelve kinds and leaves for the healing of the nations. As above, it would be difficult to say whether what we have here is a Jewish vision touched over a little by a Christian hand, or whether it is a vision of a Christian whose imagination is steeped in the Hebrew sacred imagery. The last seems to me fully to satisfy the conditions of the case.

In xxii. 6-21 we have an unquestionably Christian epilogue. The writer, who again names himself John, would fall down and worship at the feet of the angel who has shown him these things, but is bidden to worship only God. Then there are one or two phrases of great interest christologically. With the reply of the Spirit and the bride, that is, the Christian community, to the promise of Jesus, "Lo, I come," and with the word, at last, of the seer himself, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus"; with a warning against the adding to or taking from the words of the prophecy, the book closes. The warning would be the more interesting if that should be found to be the solution of the enigma of the book which, in some form or other, almost everything that we have said suggests.

Now it is obvious that the problem has not much to do with so external a matter as mere literary style. The style of the book is on the whole, perhaps, perplexingly uniform, and has some very pro-

⁶ Enoch, 91, 12 f.; Baruch, 40; iv Ezra 7, 28; cf. Pfeiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 348.

nounced characteristics. And the question is deeper than one as to the plan of the book; or the possibility of finding any plan, simple or complex, which has really been observed in the writing of it. The claims which have been made of its wonderful artistic perfectness in this respect will have to be abandoned. And yet the book certainly has a plan. But the real point is that of the two entirely distinct, not to say contradictory, modes of apprehension which run side by side almost from the beginning to the end of the book. The question is, whether and how far these things could coexist in the same mind; and if not exactly in one mind, yet in the literary work of one mind in so far as the author's work was conditioned in an apocalyptic phraseology current and sacred not only to himself but also to those for whom he wrote. That all the materials which he thus presents us cannot be thought out clearly is not quite to the point. We are not obliged to imagine that he did think clearly. But when the limits of possibility in this direction are reached, what process have we then to think — whether a collection of Jewish-Christian oracles of different age, or the incorporation of fragments of Jewish apocalyptic utterance into a Christian writing, or the translation and retouching of a Hebrew writing by a Christian hand, or what other combinations of the facts an imagination trained in hypothesis-making could devise.

Hugo Grotius⁷ maintained the apostolic authorship of the whole book. But in order to explain the discrepancies in time and place, evidence for which seemed to lie on the face of the writing, he put forth the theory that the work as we have it is made up of ten different parts, composed some of them before and some of them after the destruction of Jerusalem, some in Patmos and some in Ephesus. Hammond⁸ took up Grotius's idea, but without modifying it materially or strengthening the argument. Vogel,⁹ from observations similar to those of Grotius, but also upon the ground of differences of style and mode of representation, assumed that there were two authors, who also themselves had worked at different times upon the parts of the work attributed to them. His two writers were the Apostle and the presbyter John, of whom the latter had afterward, possibly with

⁷ *Annot. in Apocalypsin*, 1644, I. 9, IV. 1, XIV. 1.

⁸ *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament*. London, 1653 and 1659.

⁹ *Commentationes VII. de Apoc. Joh.* Erlangen, 1811-1816.

the consent of the Apostle, worked over the whole book. Bleek¹⁰ thought the thing more simply. He lets the whole book as we have it be written by the presbyter John, who worked together into his narrative, however, the two large pieces iv.-xi. and xii.-xxii., the first of which, with Jerusalem as the centre, was written before A.D. 70, and the second, with Rome as the centre, after that date. Schleiermacher¹¹ also thought that even if we must attribute the writing as we have it to one author, yet single visions in it originated in different times and had their motives in different events, and, as they stand, have often little or no connection one with another. Schwegler¹² thought that at any rate the first three chapters, containing the letters to the churches, must be separated from the rest.

Weizsäcker, in an article in the *Literaturzeitung* in 1882 (col. 78-79), spoke perhaps the first word in the more recent discussion, saying that although he was aware that he therewith departed from what had become almost an axiom of current criticism, he had nevertheless been long of the opinion that we have in the Apocalypse a compilation some parts of which are, to be sure, of very early origin, and testify to the wide exercise of the prophetic gift.¹³ The same author has put forth his opinion with more fulness in its proper place, in his great work, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche* (p. 504 f.). A pupil of the Apostle, in the name of his master, and shortly after the death of the latter, collects the prophecies of the last decades. Of these prophecies some belong to the time before the year 70. The general dramatic framework is due to this supposed pupil, and into it the different pieces have been fitted, not always exactly happily, and yet not quite purely mechanically. The first three chapters, containing the letters, and the last two, the restoration of all things, are

¹⁰ *Beitrag zur Kritik und Deutung der Offenbarung Joh.*, in *Berliner theolog. Zeitschrift*, Bd. II., 1820, 240 f. [Bleek subsequently modified his opinion respecting a difference of date between the two parts of the book, and held that both were composed at the same time, viz. either in the closing months of the reign of Galba or in the first year of Vespasian—at any rate before the destruction of Jerusalem; see his *Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, p. 81, and his (posthumous) *Vorlesungen über die Apokalypse* (1862), page 119 sq.—ED.]

¹¹ *Vorlesungen über die Einleitung in das N. T.*, 462 f.

¹² *Nachapostolisches Zeitalter*, II. 256.

¹³ See also, as to the possibility of differences in authorship, Harnack, *Litzg.* 1882, col. 561-562; and Rovers, *Theolog. Tijdschrift*, 1882, 67, "the thesis of the unity of the book is no longer an axiom of criticism." Cf. A. D. Loman, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1882, 470-476.

outside of the general plan, and have no intimate connection, even of substance, with the great prophecies of the book. In this latter material the scheme of three times seven parts, the seals, the trumpets, and the vials, is obvious enough, and is not without a reminder of the scheme of the signs, the woes, and the end of the times in the synoptical eschatological passages. But even the woes and plagues which are here fitted into this plan have no natural connection the one with the other, while the great pictures of chapters xi., xii., xiii. are of altogether a different sort. This is really historical material; that is, it is made to rest upon and to look forward to distinct historical events. It has living motives in the experiences and thought of the time. Indeed, the verses, xii. 1, xiii. 1, xiv. 1, clearly indicate the want of connection between these great visions and the context, or among themselves. They have often been called episodes. But if that means anything at all, it implies no common origin of these parts. Some of them, chapter xi. certainly, belong before the year 70. And though slight traces here and there among the others might tempt us to seek for them a date after the year 100, yet, in the absence of good evidence for this, the total coloring and spirit of the work, the view of the world, the atmosphere in which the thing moves, must be decisive. And this general character of the book bears the strongest witness to its origin within the first century.

After that first hint of Weizsäcker's, but before the publication of his last-named work, Daniel Völter, then in Tübingen, now in Amsterdam, put forth a very elaborate theory, not of compilation, but of redaction.¹⁴ An original Apocalypse of the Apostle John (in the first edition it was of the presbyter) of the year 65–66, to which the Apostle himself is then supposed to have added a supplement, parts of chapters x., xi., xiv., xvii.,—the whole analysis is far too elaborate to be given here,—then undergoes revision for the first time under Trajan, is worked over a second time in the year 129–130, and for the third time, making the fifth layer in the composition, toward the year 140 (in the first edition it was 170). The passages about the birth of the Messiah and the war with Satan, about the return and final triumph of the Messiah, fall to the first redactor, a Jewish Christian in Asia Minor. The second beast is Hadrian, and the passages about him and his worship mark the time of that emperor's going from Athens to Ephesus in the winter of 129–130. And

¹⁴ *Die Entstehung der Apokalypse*, Freiburg, 1882. 2te Aufl. 1885.

the interesting Christological passages, especially the one as to the Logos fall to the last writer, about 140.¹⁵ The minuteness of the analysis, together with the positiveness of the results obtained, is perhaps the most suspicious thing about it. To establish it, differences in style are assumed which do not exist. With more reason than is usually found in such summary judgments, Weyland brightly said:¹⁶ "Völter leaves us dissatisfied because he has done too much, and Weizsäcker because he has not done enough; the one proves more than he can, and the other less than he ought." And yet if by that last is meant that Weizsäcker has not hazarded a complete analysis, and set up an hypothesis as to the time, place, and manner of the origin of each of the parts, that is indeed a thing to be devoutly grateful for, as the example of Völter conclusively shows. I might add that Völter's last contribution,¹⁷ properly called by himself a "Streitschrift," is even wilder than the first.

The investigation certainly received a new impulse from the work of Eberhard Vischer, with a postscript by Harnack.¹⁸ His hypothesis commended itself at once to Harnack and Stade, and has since been strongly defended by them and, with more reserve, by Overbeck and Schürer. It is certainly simpler than either of those mentioned. The Apocalypse is not the result either of compilation in Weizsäcker's, or of redaction in Völter's sense.¹⁹ It is simply the translation into Greek of a Jewish apocalypse, written at any rate before 70, with an introduction and conclusion and with comparatively slight interpolation and interpretations throughout the course of the narrative, by a Christian hand, say toward the end of the first century.²⁰ It is certainly very surprising to what small compass the necessarily Christian

¹⁵ See Hilgenfeld, *Ztschft. f. wiss. Theol.* 1882, 396 f.; Holtzmann, *Jahresbericht*, 1883, 92; Jülicher, *Gött. gel. Anzgr.* 1886, No. 1.

¹⁶ *Theol. Studien*, 1886, vi. 462.

¹⁷ *Die Offenbarung Johannes keine jüdische Apokalypse*, Tübingen, 1886.

¹⁸ *Die Offenbarung Johannis eine jüdische Apokalypse in Christlicher Bearbeitung*, in "Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte d. alchristlichen Literatur," Bd. 11. Leipzig, 1886.

¹⁹ Cf. Bruston, *Les Origines de l'Apocalypse*, 1889, who distinguishes two Jewish Apocalypses, an earlier, translated into Greek, a later, written in Greek, and thinks that these two were worked together by a Jewish-Christian author.

²⁰ See Krüger, *Gött. gel. Anzgr.* 1887, No. 2; Stade, *Ztschft. f. d. alt. Wiss.* 1887, No. 1; Schürer, *Litzg.*, 1888, 135-137; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1888, No. 1; Menegoz, *Revue de Théol. et de Philosophie*, Mars, 1887; Overbeck, *Litzg.* 1887, 28; Schön, *L'Origine de l'Apocalypse de Saint Jean*, Paris, 1887, 33-84.

additions within the main narrative can, with sufficient skill and patience, be reduced. The chapters xi. and xii. are taken as the pivot of the whole demonstration, and here the assumed Christian additions comprise altogether but parts of four verses, and in two of these four cases a bare phrase. For convenience I append a table of these Christian additions, adding only that Vischer has published the text with these additions in more prominent type, as also the additions in a body by themselves.

Chap. i.-iii. Introduction.

v. 6. ἀρνίον and ὡς ἐσφαγμένον

v. 8. ἀρνίου

v. 9-14.

vi. 1. τὸ ἀρνίον

vi. 16. καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου

vii. 9-17.

ix. 11. Ἐβραϊστὶ and καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλύων

xi. 8^{b c}.

xi. 15. καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ

xii. 11.

xii. 17. Ἰησοῦ

xiii. 8. τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου

xiii. 9, 10.

xiv. 1-5.

xiv. 10. καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου

xiv. 12, 13.

xv. 3. καὶ τὴν ψδὴν τοῦ ἀρνίου

xvi. 15.

xvi. 16. Ἐβραϊστὶ

xvii. 6. καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ

xvii. 14.

xviii. 20. καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι

xix. 7. τοῦ ἀρνίου

xix. 9, 10.

xix. 11. καλούμενος πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, καὶ

xix. 13^b.

xx. [4^{a b c}] 4^c fin. [4 οὔτινες κτ έ. to 5 fin.]

Harnack assumes the result as fixed; *Dogmengeschichte*, 2 Aufl. i. 1888, 87. So also Neumann, *Der Römische Staat u. d. Allg. Kirche bis auf Diocletian*, i. 11.

xxi. 5^b = 8.

xxi. 9. τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρνίου

xxi. 14^b

xxi. 22 καὶ τὸ ἀρνίον

xxi. 23. καὶ ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἀρνίον

xxi. 27. τοῦ ἀρνίου

xxii. 1 and 3. καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου

xxii. 6-21. Conclusion.

Perhaps the strongest argument for Vischer's hypothesis is its amazing simplicity. The two currents of ideas which we have felt are most precisely accounted for. The difficulties in the christology of the Apocalypse seem to vanish. The differences in the eschatological representation, which have always been most difficult to reconcile, seem to have at once the simplest explanation in the world. The contrast between the Johannine mystical piety with its emphasis upon patience, and an occasional outburst of true Jewish ferocity and fanatical hatred of the Roman, finds its reason here. So, also, the fact that the very name of Jesus, sometimes proclaimed with such enthusiasm, vanishes again for whole chapters; and, finally, the most conspicuous, at any rate, of the difficulties as to the chronology seem from this point of view to be entirely clear.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the whole theory greatly exaggerates the clearness of the antithesis, not to say antagonism, between Judaism and Christianity in the last decades of the first century, and, let us say, in the most Jewish of Jewish-Christian minds. Vischer says that in the same matter the same man cannot have said both yes and no. That is just the point to be proved. And especially is it to be considered how far he was conscious that he was saying both yes and no. What seems to Vischer so contradictory as to furnish ample basis for his hypothesis has, nevertheless, striking parallels in the Synoptic Gospels, and notably in the Pauline Epistles. That in the Apocalypse, of all the New Testament writings, this unresolved element is largest is readily to be admitted. But Paul himself is a conspicuous example of the fact that this unresolved element, in transition works, transition times, transition men, may be the very secret of their power. Especially do I think that the antithesis between particularism and universalism has been exaggerated. It is not so true to say that we find traces of a double soteriology and christology, as to say that we find one containing elements of two.

The passages containing the allusion to the Lamb are many of them much too summarily treated by the mere striking out of the word, or imagining that the Lion stood in its place. The conception of the Lamb is in some of these places certainly part of the very depths of the sense. The supposition of translation is very difficult to maintain in the face of the evidence for the occasional use of the LXX in passages cited from the Old Testament.²¹ And, lastly, there is some weight in the argument from the name of John. For it is beyond dispute that since the middle of the second century the writing has circulated in the Christian Church under that name. That the beloved disciple should have given himself to this light retouching of a Jewish work is difficult to suppose. But that another should have put it forth under his name, with such slight variations, is not less so. The epoch-making significance of the work of Vischer in the history of the discussion is that it made so luminously clear the fact and the nature of the counter-currents in the book. But the course of the discussion since that date has shown that there are other combinations possible.

Weyland²² had at the same time with Vischer, and quite independently, hit upon a solution differing from Vischer's only in the assumption of two Jewish sources — written in Greek, however, and not translated — instead of one. The older of these Jewish sources is of the time of Nero; specifically, after the defeat of Cestius Gallus, at the time when Vespasian assumed the command. The younger belongs to the time of Titus, and was written by a Jew of the Diaspora who had seen the ruins of Jerusalem. The Christian revision is of the time of Trajan. And here again the contribution of the Christian author is not large. These two Jewish sources Weyland marks א and ב. The latter so because we come upon it second in the order of the narrative. It is, however, the older. It begins with chap. x., the new open book; contains chap. xi., the two witnesses; chap. xii., the birth of the Messiah; chap. xiii., the hostility

²¹ See the references in Schön, p. 72. As to LXX in Apoc. cf. Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalt. J. C.*, II. 709. Schürer alludes to the well-known fact that the Daniel quotations in the Apocalypse have a certain resemblance to Theodotion. Cf. Salmon, *Introduction to the Study of the Books of the N. T.*, 1889, 594–609, and Harnack in *Litzg.*, 1885, 267.

²² First in an article in the *Theolog. Studien*, Utrecht, 1886, 424–470, and since in a separate work, *Omwerkings- en Compilatie-Hypothesen toegepast op de Apokalypse van Johannes*, Groningen, 1888; see Overbeck, *Litzg.*, 1887, 29, and Weizsäcker, *Litzg.*, 1890, 465.

of the Roman world-power; chap. xiv. 6-11, the fallen Babylon; and then the coming to judgment, the new heaven and earth, xix. 11-21, xx., and xxi., 1-8.

It cannot be denied that these materials, for substance, make an apocalypse. But when we come to look at the relation of the parts one to another, and to consider the date to which they are assigned the combination is impossible. \aleph is made up as follows: iv., v. 1-7; then the seven seals and trumpets in chaps. vi. to ix. inclusive; then single pieces out of xiv., xv., xvi.; xvi. 14-20 being the last; and then the woman and the beast, chaps. xvii. and xviii.; and in conclusion, xxi. 9-27, and xxii. 1-11, and also verses 14, 15. For substance it is the picture of the judgment of Jerusalem over against that of Rome. But for a writer under Titus that former is past, is history, not prophecy. There is much in these chapters which is not in accord with that. And, indeed, the principle upon which the division of the two Jewish sources is made is not anywhere quite clear. For the Christian writer nothing remained except to work \beth into \aleph , which is regarded as the basis, with occasional touches here and there from his own point of view; and then to add the introductory chapters, the letters, and some words at the end. It will be seen that much that has been said as to Vischer applies in a way to Weyland too.

Pfleiderer's position approaches that of Weyland in assuming two Jewish sources. But he supposes, also, two Christian contributors, the one writing under Domitian and the other under Hadrian. On the whole, it seems probable to him that the great mass of material in chapters iv. to xx. 5, constitutes a Jewish apocalypse, the large part of it from the hand of an author writing in the time of Vespasian, and, indeed, toward the end of that reign, when Asia was disturbed by the expectation of the return of Nero. On the other hand chap. xi., and possibly xii., belong to the time before the destruction of Jerusalem, after the beginning of the insurrection and of the rule of the zealots in the city. Conceivably these chapters are stray leaves of apocalyptic utterance out of that dark time, which the second Jewish writer a few years later incorporated in his work. This work a Christian under Domitian — that inference rests on the interpretation of chap. xvii. — works over, retouching and interpolating such passages as v. 1-6, vii. 9-11, xii. 11-17, etc.²³

²³ For details see his *Das Urchristenthum, seine Schriften und Lehren, in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang beschrieben*, Berlin, 1887, 350.

Chapters i. to ii. and xxii. 6-21 then fall to the second Christian author, the redactor of the whole. The assumption of the first of these authors corresponds to the tradition of the appearance of the Apocalypse in the reign of Domitian. In general it speaks for the distinction of these two, that the earlier uses constantly — twenty-nine times — the expression “the Lamb” for Christ, which expression does not occur in the opening chapters nor in the conclusion at all. The christology of the first of these is an advance upon that of Paul; is proximately in the same line with that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But that of the redactor goes much farther in the use of the Logos predicate. Pfeiderer, moreover, disputes the tradition of the Ephesian residence of the Apostle John, and therewith, also, even a secondary relation of the Apocalypse, say as the work of a pupil, to the Apostle.²⁴

Two French scholars, Sabatier²⁵ and Schön²⁶ have turned the hypothesis about, and assume that the basis and the structure of the book are Christian, and that the author, writing toward the end of

²⁴ *Urchristenthum s. S. u. L.*, 318-356, esp. 350 f. Perhaps I may be allowed to enliven my page with a quotation from Hilgenfeld (*Ztschft. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1890, 395), in which he disposes of all these gentlemen at once, and cardinally illustrates how a man may maintain his cheerfulness even in the face of such a subject as this. “Wer sich für Völter erklärt, dem sind, wie Harnack meint, die Schuppen noch nicht von den Augen gefallen. Wer dagegen Eberhard Vischer als den kritischen Columbus der Apokalypse anerkennt, der lässt sich, wie Völter meint, in den April schicken. Mit dem Hessischen Seher der christlich-eingerahmten jüdischen Apokalypse wetteifert aber der Holländische Doppelseher von zwei jüdischen Apokalypsen in der Johannes Apokalypse. Solche Doppelseherei ist dann fortgeschritten zu Pfeiderer's doppelter Doppelseherei von zwei jüdischen und zwei christlichen Schriftstellern, welche die Johannes-Apokalypse zusammengeschrieben haben, und hat ihre Vollendung erreicht durch Spitta, welcher zwischen den christlichen Urapokalyptiker und den christlichen Redaktor eine jüdische Caligula- ja eine jüdische Pompeius-Apokalypse einschiebt.” Hilgenfeld will have none of all this (see also *Ztschrift. f. w. Theol.* 1882, 396 f., 1888, 374-378, but maintains the position of old-Tübingen. In the article here quoted he gives by far the most satisfactory discussion of the letters of the first three chapters, which in all the works we are speaking of have failed of their due share of attention. Reuss also, *Geschichte d. heil. Schriften d. N. T.*, 6te Aufl. 1887, 147 f., rejects the whole hypothesis.

²⁵ *Revue de Théologie*, Lausanne, 1887, since published separately, *Les Origines littéraires et la Composition de l'Apocalypse de Saint Jean*, Paris, 1888.

²⁶ *L'Origine de l'Apocalypse de Saint Jean*, Paris, 1887. See also Bavon, *Revue de Théologie et de Phil.*, 1887, 329-362, who notes the Jewish and Christian elements in the book, but without abandoning its unity.

the first century, has simply taken up into his work now smaller and now larger pieces of Jewish oracles, familiar and sacred, some of them from before the time of the fall of Jerusalem. Sabatier, while conceding the simplicity of Vischer's hypothesis, and the advantages of it and of some of those related to it, points out the fact (which these have all ignored) that the letters to the seven churches are, nevertheless, marked by certain qualities of rhetoric and symbolism which characterize the whole work. He goes so far as to say that the letters contain all of the leading motives of the book. And for the later part, in some cases the process of incorporation of fragments of Jewish oracles has been that of simple insertion. Of this he holds that the break between ix. 21 and xi. 14 is a shining example. It is interesting to note that Weyland makes this same remark about the same passage, only that for him it is the bringing of a piece out of one of his Jewish apocalypses into the other; while for Sabatier it is the bringing it out of Jewish circles into the one Christian writing with which we have to deal. Fragments from the time of the Jewish war are chaps. xi. 1-13, xii. 1-13 and verse 18, xiv. 6-20, xvi. 13-16, xvii. 1-19, etc. That is, no original connection of the passages among themselves is assumed. The scraps had, perhaps, some of them shortly after their appearance lost their first meaning and application. They are to be saved to a new one. And it is to the peculiar process here described that the book owes the interruptions in its plan, the delays in its progress, the striking cases in which a Jewish passage has a Christian one placed beside it, and in general the double face which the book so largely presents. The theory of Sabatier is original in the highest degree, and most apt in dealing with certain of the facts. Schön builds upon his foundation, and his work may perhaps best be described as an effort to combine the great mass of facts which in these years of the discussion have been brought to light in Sabatier's interpretation of them, so far as possible with the traditional view. He does this by calling attention to the marks of the genuine Johannine spirit—that of the Fourth Gospel, by minimizing the amount of material which must necessarily be attributed to Jewish sources, and by discriminating from this material which may nevertheless closely resemble it, namely the Jewish-Christian adoption of symbolism, working over of visions, etc., from the Old Testament prophets. There is no question that he is right in an assertion, which Beyschlag also has made, that the Jewish and the earliest

Christian eschatology were closely related, and are very difficult to separate with any sort of critical certainty.²⁷

Schön has also put with great clearness a thing which the others have overlooked, and to which the fascinations of critical analysis tend to make one blind: namely the fact that much that is to be assigned to Jewish influence is not therewith by any means made out as of Jewish authorship; that very much of that sort of thing might exist in the mind and memory of a Jewish-Christian author, and influence him perhaps unconsciously. What I may call the shading at the edges of some of the Jewish passages is a thing at least to be noticed, and constitutes perhaps the greatest difficulty which the process of their critical separation presents. "Il est clair que les visions intercalées dans l'ensemble de l'oeuvre ont dû avoir une influence sur les versets voisins; elles sont ordinairement introduites plus ou moins habilement; la fin est presque toujours remaniée ou se confond avec les idées qui appartiennent en propre à l'auteur. Il est évident par exemple que l'explication de la bête donnée au chapitre xvii. 9-18, a été amenée par la vision du chapitre xiii., qu'il s'agit de rendre intelligible. Mais ici l'influence de l'auteur chrétien domine, tandis que dans les grandes visions juives celle du premier écrivain est prépondérante. Enfin le voyant chrétien est tellement pénétré des souvenirs des anciens prophètes que beaucoup de leurs images ont passé dans son oeuvre, où elles ont pris une signification nouvelle. Dans ces conditions, ce n'est plus qu'une affaire de plus ou de moins, et il est difficile de déterminer exactement ce qui appartient à l'auteur et ce qui est d'origine étrangère" (p. 135.). Schön finds only xi. 1-13, xii. 1-9, and 13-17, chaps. xiii. and xviii. to be necessarily of Jewish origin.²⁸

Rovers²⁹ is the first of Dutch or German students who seems really to have felt the weight of many considerations which Sabatier-Schön have adduced in support of their view. But he leans on the whole to the view of Vischer-Harnack as given above, and has added some elements of strength to their argument from investigation of his own.

²⁷ Beyschlag, *Die Apokalypse gegen die jüngste kritische Hypothese in Schutz genommen*, Stud. u. Krit., 1888, 102-138; Briggs, *Presbyterian Review*, 1888, 109-115 and 263-284.

²⁸ See Schürer, *Ltztg.*, 1888, 135.

²⁹ *Apokalyptische Studien*, Leiden, 1888; see Weizsäcker, *Ltztg.*, 1890, 465.

The latest larger contribution, so far as I know, to the discussion is that of Friedrich Spitta.⁸⁰ This book of almost six hundred pages is a new combination of the materials, yet having something in common with several of those which have been given before. The original writing is a Christian one of John Mark about 60 A.D.; but this is to be distinguished from the work of a Christian reviser, who had (beside the one Christian) two Jewish sources at his disposal, one of them of the time of Pompeius, and the second of that of Caligula. These three sources are all complete apocalypses, that is, not single visions, nor yet even collections of visions, but works possessing unity and plan, treating events from their present in each case to the end of all things. And they were alike, strangely enough, not only in that they all ended in the overthrow of the hostile world-power and the triumph of the kingdom of God, but even in this, that they all contained a vision of seven judgments to take place before the end. For the seven seals, the seven trumpets, and the seven vials fall to the three different sources. And the three are again all more or less alike in the way that they clothe the events of their own time with the postulates of their faith. Accordingly, the redactor has not much to do but to work these three together as best he can. The division is so complicated that it is a matter for profound gratitude that the text is presented at the close of the volume, divided according to this theory. And when we look at these supposed sources thus arranged, the first thing which strikes us is the exceedingly suspicious symmetry of the three when compared the one with the other. And the next impression is of the absolute want of connection between the component parts within themselves, the impossibility that the materials can have stood in that way in original writings. It is very doubtful if the old unquestioning assumption of the unity of the book will not seem simpler and more probable than such an hypothesis as this.

Paul Schmidt⁸¹ goes even farther than Spitta: leaving only the introduction and conclusion, the work of redaction, and an occasional interpolation to the Christian hand. He puts forth the following division:

I. The Vision of the Seals, iv. 1–vii. 8; (vii. 9 f. being a Christian insertion).

⁸⁰ *Die Offenbarung des Johannes untersucht*, Halle, 1889; see Weizsäcker, *Litztg.*, 1890, 468.

⁸¹ *Anmerkungen über die Komposition der Offenbarung Johannis*, Freiburg, 1891.

II. The Vision of the Trumpets, viii. 2-xi. 15, with the insertion of x. 1-xi. 13, the open book and the temple.

III. The Book of the Messiah, xii. 1-xxii. 5, with insertion of xiv. 6-20, and also of xvii. 1-xix. 5; the first of these being the announcement and fulfilment of the judgment upon Rome, and the second the vision of the single beast and of the woman in scarlet.

It seems to Schmidt that in these three great pieces, minus the interpolations, we have three distinct Jewish sources, and these are thought to have been translated into Greek by the redactor.⁸²

Now nothing is more obvious from the consideration of such work as this — and the thought will doubtless have suggested itself to our readers long ago — than that the matter of exact analysis with a view to determining the sources of the book, their dates, authorship, etc., can easily be overdone. It is doubtful if it will ever be possible to reconstruct the sources in such a way that the results shall be critically authoritative, however satisfactory each new effort in this direction may appear to those who put it forth. Upon almost any point of detail in Vischer and the rest, one can always illustrate how easy it is, by the striking out of a few words, to bring the passage under discussion to a form in which it can be assigned, even with seeming great probability, to Jewish authorship. But it remains, as Weizsäcker has perfectly correctly pointed out, that that is not at all the question. The question is, whether, without striking out anything, it can be assigned to a Christian origin. Under all the attempts of which we have latterly spoken, there lies the assumption that a part of the book is actually Jewish, not Jewish-Christian; and that not in the sense of influence, but strictly of literary authorship. It is that assumption which at present needs to be made good. It is this which requires to be studied: How much of what is here can be conceived as existing in the mind of one man, or in the minds of men of one stamp, Jewish Christians; and how mechanically were they capable of dealing with the current apocalyptic material? How Jewish was the earliest Christianity?

It is, I think, beyond dispute that the recognition of the process of

⁸² Weiss, *Einleitung in d. N. T.*, 2te Aufl., 1889, 375, has a partial, and Holtzmann, *Handcommentar zum N. T.*, iv. Bd., 1891, 256 f., an admirable résumé of the discussion; while Düsterdieck, *Krit. Exeg. Handbuch über d. Offenbarung Joh.*, 4te Aufl., 1887, 26, passes it over almost without mention.

Hellenizing which the Christianity of the second century underwent has blunted the appreciation of the intense Judaic character of at least a part of the Christianity of the first. There was a truth on the side of old-Tübingen, after all, which in the reaction is in danger of being ignored. And as in the old days the authorship of the Apocalypse was one of the few things in which that School had the privilege of agreeing with the conservatives, so it is interesting to observe that it is now the representatives of that School, in so far as it has any, who unite with the men of the extreme right in insisting that the considerations last named are at any rate a part of the problem. The point which is already made out beyond all question is the heterogeneousness of the materials which the book presents and of the modes of representation it employs. It is not certainly made out to what cause we have to attribute that heterogeneousness. How much of it can be believed to have existed in a man, and how much of it must be thought of as in writing before him, is a matter of judgment upon which there will hardly be unanimity. But even the recognition of these matters is a great help in the interpretation of what has often seemed beyond intelligent apprehension. The appeal of the book to the Christian consciousness, even under lamentable misinterpretations of it; the return to it of the church in dark times and of the individual in his sorrows, and in the face of death, is not, indeed, a consideration which enters into the critical question in any way. But it is certainly one which has to do with the burden of proof, and justifies the assumption that it is after all a Christian book, — at least until the contrary shall be proved. And it is certainly true, upon purely historical and critical grounds, that only by return to some such statement of the question as that given above will the criticism of the book escape as many wild experiments and fruitless efforts in this field as the old-fashioned allegorists used to be guilty of in theirs.